

from claim 3 and thus includes the amendment to claim 1, claim 5 depends from claim 1 as amended. Claims 1 – 5 remain in the case.

Claims 1 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the U. K. application of Mac Taggart. The Mac Taggart patent application in the U. K. discloses a trouser garment in Fig. 3, but on page 7, lines 11 – 15, “the trouser garment 111 includes pockets (not shown) to contain one or more sachets of crystals, as described above, and intended to react with oxygen to generate heat.”

The Mac Taggart patent also discloses an anorak garment 151 in Fig. 4 for covering the chest and head, but on page 8, lines 20 – 25 states, “As with the trouser garment 111 the anorak garment 151 will include pockets (not shown) for containing sachets of heat generating crystals . . . .”

Thus the Mac Taggart articles of clothing themselves do not comprise a self-heat system throughout all of the clothing article itself, but pockets in which heat generating materials may be inserted. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the integrally formed clothing item has the self-heat system incorporated therein and throughout the clothing item itself without the need for pockets in which heat generating materials can be inserted. Also the amendment to claim 1 recites that no parts of said article of clothing are removable therefrom and re-attachable thereto., so a pocket type garment with heat generating materials insertable into and removable therefrom is specifically excluded. Thus, the Mac Taggart reference appears to be patentably distinguished by the amendments to claim 1, and claim 1 should now be allowable.

Claim 2 has been similarly amended and should thus be allowable over the Mac Taggart reference for the same reasons.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 as amended and thus includes the amendments to claim 1. Claim 3 should likewise be allowable if claim 1 as amended is now allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 so it also includes the amendments to claim 1, so claim 4 should be allowable over the cited reference if claim 1 as amended is now allowable.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and should thus be allowable over the cited reference if claim 1 as amended is allowable.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

A clean copy of the claims in the case as presently amended is submitted along with this amendment and response to Official Action.



Ernest Kettelson Reg No 20,421  
Attorney for the Applicant

Date: Dec 10, 2004

Ernest Kettelson  
KETTELSON LAW OFFICES, LTD.  
Wynderiidge Place  
P. O. Box 2517  
Joliet, Illinois 60434  
Phone: 815-467-1400  
FAX: 815-467-1461

The undersigned attorney certifies that the foregoing document was deposited with the

United States Postal Service on the 10th day of December, 2004, in an envelop addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

